

**TEC Meeting Evaluation Summary**  
**San Antonio, Texas**  
**February 6-7, 2008**

**Attendee Affiliation:**

TEC Member Organizations: **19 (38%)**  
State, Tribal or Local Official: **21 (42%)**  
U.S. Department of Energy: **2 (4%)**  
DOE Contractor: **3 (6%)**  
Other (e.g., AULG, DOT): **5 (10%)**

**Assessment of Agenda Topics:**

DOE Program Updates:

- **42% very useful**
- **58% somewhat useful**

Plenary I – Tribal Cultural Discussion:

- **40% very useful**
- **36% somewhat useful**
- **14% not useful**
- **10% didn't attend**

Plenary II – Evaluation of Shortline Railroads

- **56% very useful**
- **38% somewhat useful**
- **6% not useful**

Plenary III – Addressing Risk Perception

- **74% very useful**
- **16% somewhat useful**
- **6% not useful**
- **4% didn't attend**

**Assessment of Breakout Sessions**

OCRWM Issues

- **27% very useful**
- **51% somewhat useful**
- **8% not useful**
- **14% didn't attend**

EM Issues

- **32% very useful**
- **44% somewhat useful**
- **3% not useful**
- **21% didn't attend**

**Assessment of Topic Group Sessions**

Tribal:

- **23% very useful**
- **12% somewhat useful**
- **2% not useful**
- **63% didn't attend**

Rail:

- **33% very useful**
- **36% somewhat useful**
- **4% not useful**
- **27% didn't attend**

Routing:

- **33% very useful**
- **37% somewhat useful**
- **6% not useful**
- **24% didn't attend**

TEC Direction and Priorities

- **62% very useful**
- **13% somewhat useful**
- **25% didn't attend**

## **Logistical Questions:**

1. Most of the pre-meeting announcements, registrations, and information dissemination were provided electronically. How did this distribution work for you?

100% stated that it worked well. Additional comments included:

- More advance information would be useful.
- Very hard to get involved.
- Not enough information on the TEC website – include all the pre-meeting materials on the website for ease of access.

2. Were you generally satisfied with the hotel, meeting rooms, and location? How might logistical arrangements for the next meeting be improved?

85% reported being at least generally satisfied. Additional comments included:

- Hotel was not close enough to restaurants and the central part of the city.
- Need separate meeting rooms, could hear discussions in other rooms.
- Liked the free WiFi
- Go back to an open square format for the topic groups.
- Tribal topic group is growing and needs a larger breakout room.
- Need a separate speaker system for the topic groups.
- Need better seating arrangements for the topic groups to facilitate discussions.
- Would prefer the winter meeting be in Washington, DC – would enable more communication with staff.
- Schedule half-day meeting on first and last day to facilitate travel.
- Hard to get around without a rental car.

## **Topical Questions:**

### **Rail**

*Topics or Issues discussed by Topic Group:*

- Review of intermodal issues
- Operational issues that increase risks of intermodal shipments
- Administrative issues (e.g., workplan)
- Radiation monitoring
- Sharing of monitoring data

*Were your issues addressed adequately?*

- Request for cooperating agency status (December 2006) has not been answered by DOE
- Need to form an operations subgroup

*What still needs to be addressed?*

- Transportation by barge in the eastern U.S.
- Impact of remote monitoring on inspections
- Modal issues
- Need to develop a monitoring system that will minimize en route inspections
- Subgroups need to be elevated to group status

- Events that should and should not prompt a radiological survey

## **Routing**

*Topics or Issues discussed by Topic Group:*

- Task plan implementation
- Routing standard problem

*Were your issues addressed adequately?*

- Could have been if the group members were better prepared

*What still needs to be addressed?*

- Continuation of standard problem exercise after receiving AAR input
- Routing principles
- The group has problems staying on task (i.e., stick to the workplan)

## **Tribal**

*Topics or Issues discussed by Topic Group:*

- Tribal concerns
- Tribal culture
- Availability of funding, especially 180(c)
- Conference calls
- Affected status
- Mission/position statement
- Emergency response capabilities of tribes
- Lawsuits

*Were your issues addressed adequately?*

- Need more decision-makers in attendance
- Poor moderation of topic group, it turned into a “bitch session”

*What still needs to be addressed?*

- DOE needs to answer the follow-up questions to the original list that came out of the Denver tribal conference
- Funding
- Clarification of timeframes for 180(c) implementation
- Action items for the tribal group
- Need to develop adequate tribal technical expertise to participate on other groups

## **Topical Questions – General**

1. What would you like to see the group **focus** on next, if anything?

- Planning
- Operations
- Emerging technologies

- Communications
- Social risk
- EM issues
- CVSA standards and inspections
- Caliente route
- European experience with SNF shipments
- Intermodal routing
- Tribal workshop
- Defining specific mitigation on building railroad across private and public lands
- Information security
- Shortline rail infrastructure needs
- GNEP
- NTP
- Basic nuclear science and nuclear hazards orientation

2. What are the **emerging issues** TEC should address?

- Technology and voice and data interoperability to share information and achieve better situational awareness
- Social risk
- EM SNF transfer transportation planning
- Communications
- Greater than Class C disposition
- Smart casks
- More funding, especially for tribal activities
- Potential conflicts between state and local regulations for rail
- Cultural risk communication
- Confirming the primary route
- Remote sensing and monitoring
- Utility perspectives on transport
- Navajo Nation policy
- Minor railroad mishaps – what triggers a response?

3. Is there anything about the meeting that you particularly **LIKED**?

- Presentation on social risks and risk perception
- Shortline rail presentation
- Rotating breakout sessions
- Refreshments
- Interchange of ideas
- Plenary sessions
- Pre-meeting distribution of materials
- Tribal presentation
- Willingness of DOE to listen to stakeholder input
- Accommodation of request for additional tribal caucus
- TEC directions and priorities discussion

4. Is there anything about the meeting that you particularly **DISLIKED**?

- Tribal presentations are becoming slightly vitriolic
- Consecutive non-participatory sessions – hard to be talked at for an extended period
- Insistence of a few to dominate discussions
- Flip charts – Use technology (i.e., smart boards)

- Hotel
- Pass out disks or handouts of presentations
- Not keeping sessions on schedule
- Physical arrangement of topic group sessions – go back to open tables. Reduce size of groups.
- Tribes being brought into the process so late
- Format of meeting did not allow tribes to participate outside of the tribal sessions
- DOE answers to questions clouded by “budget constraints”
- Pre-recorded rail presentation – doesn’t allow for any flexibility with respect to schedules
- New DOE staff don’t know much
- Social risk discussion was too long and did not allow enough time for questions. DOE will not address property values so why talk about them?
- Late lunch on second day and meetings scheduled until 5:30 pm
- Use of cell phones by attendees during the meeting/wearing cowboy hats made it hard to see the screen
- Don’t put the refreshments at the back of the room – conversations take away from the on-going sessions
- Not enough opportunity for feedback on EM presentation
- Property values are a bad measure of public perception of risk issues

5. How would you rate the meeting overall?

Good: **63%**

Excellent: **29%**

Average: **8%**